

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. No claims have been added or canceled. Claim 6 has been amended for clarification. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 7 are the independent claims.

Applicant appreciates Examiner Chen's time and attention during the telephone conference with Applicant's representative on November 15, 2007 regarding the scope of the cited reference and the distinguishing features of the claims. Specifically, the meaning and context of the "chip-external components" described in the cited art U.S. Patent No. 5,995,817 to Lubbe *et al.* ("Lubbe") (Lubbe, c. 1, l. 58 – c. 2, l. 4).

The present application discloses a receiver with a high-cut control function and a de-emphasis function. Conventional receivers generally require externally mounted capacitors that increase the manufacturing cost and the size of the receiver (Specification – p. 4, ll. 14-22). By sharing parts between the high-cut control function and the de-emphasis function, the disclosed receiver overcomes this problem in the art (Specification – p. 5, ll. 13-18).

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Lubbe. The rejection is respectfully traversed because Lubbe does not disclose a selection of the plurality of selectable resistive elements based on a reception level, as claimed.

Independent claim 1 recites "a selection of the plurality of selectable resistive elements, the selection based on a reception level." The other independent claims recite similar features. The Examiner has previously acknowledged that Lubbe does not disclose using more than one resistor (*Office Action dated 2/8/07* – p. 7). In fact, the equivalent circuit disclosed in Lubbe has only a single resistor in connection with variable capacitance (*See Lubbe, FIG. 4*).

In the present Office Action and as explained in the teleconference, the Office Action refers to the "chip-external components" mentioned in Lubbe at c. 1, ll. 60-65, as adjustable resistors (Office Action dated 8/20/07 – p. 2). However, these resistors mentioned in Lubbe are not used or combined with the circuit disclosed in Lubbe. Rather, Lubbe teaches one to *not* use such chip-external components stating that "[a]djusting these components requires some effort." Lubbe teaches a circuit that has no external components (c. 2, ll. 5-8, "The

invention is based on the problem of providing a device ... which can fundamentally be formed completely as an integrated circuit.”). In fact, it is only the theoretical equivalent circuit disclosed in Lubbe that has a single resistance (*See Lubbe, FIG. 4*), not a “plurality of selectable resistive elements,” as claimed.

Furthermore, these resistors mentioned in Lubbe are not selected based on a reception level as claimed. Rather, they are used for *calibration* during the *production* of the device. Lubbe explicitly states that “*during production* of the audio device, *calibration* must be performed ... [h]itherto one used chip-external components (resistors) for this purpose.” Lubbe discloses no other purpose for the chip-external components. In fact, no resistors are present in the disclosed embodiment shown in FIG. 3, and only one resistor is shown in the theoretical equivalent circuit shown in FIG. 4.

Accordingly, Lubbe does not disclose every feature of the claims, as required for anticipation. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Date: January 4, 2008

/Michael A. Koptiw/
Michael A. Koptiw
Registration No. 57,900

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439